

1 magistrate judge “is afforded broad discretion, which will be overruled only if abused.”
2 *Columbia Pictures, Inc. v. Bunnell*, 245 F.R.D. 443, 446 (C.D. Cal. 2007) (citation omitted).
3 The district judge “may not simply substitute its judgment” for that of the magistrate judge.
4 *Grimes v. City & Cty. of San Francisco*, 951 F.2d 236, 241 (9th Cir. 1991).

5 Here, Plaintiff fails to articulate how Magistrate Judge Nancy J. Koppe’s Order Denying
6 the Motion for Reconsideration is “clearly erroneous or contrary to law.” *See* D. Nev. Local
7 Rule 1B 3-1(a). Plaintiff broadly asserts that Judge Koppe denied his Motion for
8 Reconsideration “without understanding or paying attention to the actual facts that he lacks
9 legal education of the law” and otherwise faces a language barrier in conducting discovery.
10 (*See* Mot. Request Replies at 3, ECF No. 54). Judge Koppe, however, addressed this exact
11 argument in the Order Denying Appointment of Counsel, concluding that such barriers do not
12 support appointment of counsel given Plaintiff’s cogent and well-articulated motions. (*See*
13 Order Denying Mot. Appointment Counsel 1:23–2:3, ECF No. 26). Having reviewed the
14 record before Judge Koppe, along with the subsequent briefing of the parties, the Court finds
15 that the Order Denying the Motion for Reconsideration, (ECF No. 45), was not clearly
16 erroneous or contrary to the law.²

17 //

18 //

19 //

20 //

21 //

22 //

23 //

24

25 ² Plaintiff does not provide any new arguments in his Second Motion – Request for Replies to ECF No. 50
Objection, (ECF No. 58).

1 Accordingly,

2 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Motion – Request for Replies to ECF No. 50
3 Objection, (ECF No. 54), and the Second Motion – Request for Replies to ECF No. 50
4 Objection, (ECF No. 58), are **DENIED**.

5 **DATED** this 7 day of May, 2021.

6
7 
8 _____
9 Gloria M. Navarro, District Judge
10 United States District Court
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25